

Decision _____

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Order Instituting Rulemaking on the Commission's Own Motion to Consider Alternative-Fueled Vehicle Tariffs, Infrastructure and Policies to Support California's Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Goals.

Rulemaking 09-08-009
(Filed August 20, 2009)

**DECISION GRANTING COMPENSATION TO THE GREEN POWER INSTITUTE
FOR SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO DECISIONS
(D.) 13-06-014 AND D.13-11-002**

Claimant: The Green Power Institute (GPI)	For contribution to D.13-06-014 and D.13-11-002
Claimed: \$79,934.00	Awarded: \$59,632.65 (reduced by 25%)
Assigned Commissioner: Carla J. Peterman	Assigned Administrative Law Judge (ALJ): Regina DeAngelis

PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES

A. Brief Description of Decision:	<p>D.13-06-014: This Decision extends the common-facility treatment for distribution-system upgrades necessitated by residential PEV charging for three additional years.</p> <p>D.13-11-002: This Decision modifies the requirements in D.11-07-029 for an Electric Vehicle (EV) submetering protocol, and adopts the Energy Division (ED) staff proposal for a two-phase pilot project.</p>
--	---

B. Claimant must satisfy intervenor compensation requirements set forth in Public Utilities Code Sections 1801-1812:

	Claimant	CPUC Verified
Timely filing of notice of intent to claim compensation (NOI) (§ 1804(a)):		
1. Date of Prehearing Conference	Nov. 18, 2009	Verified.
2. Other Specified Date for NOI:		

3. Date NOI Filed:	Dec. 18, 2009	Verified.
4. Was the NOI timely filed?		Yes.
Showing of customer or customer-related status (§ 1802(b)):		
5. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	R.09-08-009	Verified.
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	Jan. 28, 2010	Verified.
7. Based on another California Public Utilities Commission (Commission) determination (specify):		
8. Has the Claimant demonstrated customer or customer-related status?		Yes.
Showing of “significant financial hardship” (§ 1802(g)):		
9. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:		A. 14-04-014
10. Date of ALJ ruling:		September 26, 2014
11. Based on another Commission determination (specify):	D.12-06-014 (<i>see</i> Comment #1 below)	Incorrect citation to Decision.
12. Has the Claimant demonstrated significant financial hardship?		Yes.
Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):		
13. Identify Final Decision:	D.13-11-002	Verified.
14. Date of Issuance of Final Order or Decision:	Nov. 19, 2013	Verified.
15. File date of compensation request:	Jan. 13, 2014	Verified.
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		Yes.

C. Additional Comments on Part I:

#	Intervenor’s Comment(s)	CPUC Discussion
1	The GPI was found to show “significant financial hardship” in D.12-06-014 in this proceeding, which awarded compensation to GPI for substantial contributions to previous Decisions in the proceeding.	D.12-06-014 does not address GPI’s showing of significant financial hardship. As such, we use the most recent ruling in Application (A.) 14-04-014 for the showing in this proceeding.

PART II: SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION

A. In the fields below, describe in a concise manner Claimant’s contribution to the final decision (*see* § 1802(i), § 1803(a) & D.98-04-059).

Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
--------------------------------------	---	-----------------

D.13-06-014, Authorizes Extension of Provisions re: Tariff Rules 15 and 16	(Please note that Attachment 2 includes a list of GPI Pleadings relevant to this Claim.)	Yes; Attachment 2 is not included in the Intervenor. Compensation Decision.
<p>1. Extend Common Facility Treatment for Three Years</p> <p>D.11-07-029 determined on an interim basis that facility upgrade costs associated with residential Public Electric Vehicle (PEV) charging would be given common facility treatment. This D.13-06-014, extends the common facility treatment for an additional three years, and removes the cap on the size of the eligible interconnection.</p> <p>The GPI argued for an indefinite extension of the common facility treatment, until there was evidence that there were significant costs involved. We supported the three-year extension.</p>	<p>GPI/CEC's <i>Comments on Load Research and Submetering Roadmap</i>, 4/9/13, at 6-7.</p> <p>Responding to a question in the <i>Ruling</i>, the GPI argued, on pg. 6 of our <i>Comments</i>: "As the Scoping Memo demonstrates, costs thus far for residential service facility upgrades have been de minimis. As such, GPI/CEC recommend that the current policy extend indefinitely, but costs should be reviewed every two years to ensure that costs remain reasonable. At the least, the current policy should be extended another three years, as the Scoping Memo suggests is a possibility."</p> <p>GPI/CEC's <i>Comments on the Proposed Decision (PD)</i>, 6/11/13, at 2-3.</p> <p>On pg. 3 of our <i>Comments on the PD</i>, we state: "GPI/CEC agree with the PD's general conclusion, though, as the PD itself notes (at 9-10), we recommended that the policy be extended indefinitely with biennial reviews to ensure that costs do not become inappropriate – rather than the three-year extension that the PD recommends. We support the three-year extension, however, as a less aggressive policy solution than what we initially recommended."</p> <p>GPI/CEC's <i>Reply Comments on the PD</i>, 6/24/13, at 2.</p> <p>On pg. 2 of our <i>Reply</i>, we argue: "We also recommend, at the least, that the PD be revised to allow up to 7.7 kW, as the Electric Vehicle Service Provided (EVSP) Coalition argues in its opening comments, but rounded up to 8 Kilowatt (kW)."</p>	Verified.

	<p>On pg. 9, the Decision acknowledges our argument for an indefinite extension of common-facility treatment.</p> <p>On pg. 13, the Decision extends the interim policy for 3 years.</p> <p>On pg. 19, the Decision acknowledges our support for the 7 kW limit on facilities eligible for common-facility treatment.</p> <p>On pg. 18, the Decision removes the capacity cap on eligible facilities.</p>	
<p>2. Order Utilities to Continue EV Load Research Activities</p> <p>D.11-07-029 ordered the utilities to conduct PEV-related load research. This D.13-06-014, orders the utilities to continue conducting the load-research data.</p> <p>The GPI argued for the extension of the research in conjunction with the extension in common-facility treatment.</p>	<p>GPI/CEC's <i>Comments on Load Research and Submetering Roadmap</i>, 2/21/12, at 1-4.</p> <p>On pg. 4 of our <i>Comments</i>, we argued: "We also request that the California Public utilities Commission (Commission) extend the end-date for load research reporting, from the current Jan. 1, 2013 to Jan. 1, 2015. The Electric Vehicle (EV) market is undergoing profound changes at this time. Any reporting that ends at the beginning of 2013 is very unlikely to capture pertinent information about the EV market in 2015 or later years."</p> <p>GPI/CEC's <i>Comments on Load Research and Submetering Roadmap</i>, 4/9/13 at 7.</p> <p>Responding to a question in the <i>Ruling</i>, the GPI argued, on pg. 7 of our <i>Comments</i>: "GPI/CEC agree with the Scoping Memo's directive to the Investor-Owned Utilities (IOUs) to continue load research and cost studies until ordered to stop. As such, this ongoing data collection will allow vetting of issues as they arise. We recommend, as discussed above, that every two years, at the least, the Commission reconsider the ratepayer costs of its policies resulting from this proceeding."</p> <p>On pg. 15, the Decision states:</p>	Verified.

	<p>“D.11-07-029 ordered the utilities to perform certain PEV-related load research to help parties and the Commission understand the distribution upgrade costs. This load research was valuable in understanding these costs. Today, we direct the utilities to continue this research during the next three years.”</p>	
D.13-11-002, Modifies the Requirements for Development of PEV Submetering Protocol		
<p>3. Adopt Roadmap for 2-Phase Pilot Project</p> <p>D.11-07-029 set the parameters for the development of residential PEV submetering protocols. The GPI was an active participant in the early development of the protocols, late 2011 – early 2012, when the set of use cases was established. We contributed to the development of Southern California Edison Company’s (SCE) early pilots during 2012, and continued to work on the development of the strawman proposal on submetering.</p> <p>In March, 2013, the Commission issued a new scoping memo in this proceeding, which proposed, as the next step in the protocol development, a two-phase pilot project to be conducted by the IOUs.</p>	<p>GPI/CEC’s <i>Comments on Load Research and Submetering Roadmap</i>, 2/21/12, at 4-12.</p> <p>In our <i>Comments</i>, we are critical of the utilities for their resistance to submetering in general, and for the reflection of that resistance in their resistance to the development of the submetering roadmap.</p> <p>GPI’s <i>Reply on Load Research and Submetering Roadmap</i>, 3/2/12, at 3-13.</p> <p>In our <i>Reply</i> we criticize the utilities for their resistance to the development of the submetering roadmap, and for their efforts to delay the completion of the roadmap. As we state, on pg. 3, “A broad theme that emerged in the Roadmap stakeholder process and in opening comments is that SCE and Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) seem to be trying to continually re-litigate issues that the Commission has already decided. GPI urges the Commission to re-affirm those issues that it has already decided, such as requiring the utilities to submit a submetering protocol and tariffs by a</p>	<p>Verified; but we note Green Power Institute put forth arguments that were duplicative of other parties on this issue. This demonstrates the parties failed to adequately coordinate resulting in duplicative efforts.¹ .</p>

¹ See Pub. Util. Code §1801.3(f) (stating that intervenor compensation program articles “shall be administered in a manner that avoids unproductive or unnecessary participation that duplicates the participation of similar interests otherwise adequately represented or participation that is not necessary for a fair determination of the proceeding.”); See also Decision (D.) 15-05-016.

<p>D.13-11-002 adopts the staff roadmap on submetering, and orders the utilities to conduct a two-phase pilot project.</p> <p>The GPI supported the pilot-project approach, while expressing concern about the urgent need to develop workable submetering protocols.</p>	<p>date certain, and to develop subtractive billing as a means for providing a viable third party submetering option.”</p> <p><i>GPI/CEC’s Comments on Load Research and Submetering Roadmap</i>, 4/9/13, at 2.</p> <p>In response to the March 2013 staff proposal’s suggestion to conduct a two-phase pilot project, the GPI argued, on pg. 2 of our <i>Comments</i>: “GPI/CEC would prefer that the Commission’s original submetering protocol development schedule be adhered to, but we will not object to the pilot proposal and its alternative schedule. We certainly see benefits from the pilot project proposal, including finding a middle ground solution between utility opposition and other parties’ positions.”</p> <p>On pgs. 17-44 of the Decision, the Commission adopts the roadmap, and orders the utilities to conduct a two-phase pilot project as the next step in the development of a set of the submetering protocols: “We adopt the March 2013 Staff Proposal for the Development of EV Submetering as modified below (D.13-11-002, at 18).”</p>	
<p>4. Commit to Both Phases of Pilot Without Contingencies or Delays</p> <p>The utilities and other parties wanted to sequence the two phases of the pilot, and make conducting the second pilot contingent on the successful completion of the first pilot. The GPI argued that the second pilot should not be contingent on the completion of the first, and in favor of conducting the two phases in tandem to the extent possible.</p> <p>D.13-11-002 determines that</p>	<p><i>GPI/CEC’s Comments on Load Research and Submetering Roadmap</i>, 4/9/13, at 5.</p> <p>Responding to a question in the <i>Ruling</i>, the GPI argued, on pg. 5 of our <i>Comments</i>: “Regarding the appropriate sharing of these costs between EVSPs and the utilities, GPI/CEC recommend a simple solution: each entity pays for its own involvement.”</p> <p>Responding to another question in the <i>Ruling</i>, the GPI argued, on pg. 5 of our <i>Comments</i>: “GPI/CEC feel strongly that both pilots should run concurrently. We have been concerned at the highly protracted nature of this proceeding, which has already run two years longer than D.11-07-029 provided for to</p>	<p>Verified; but some duplication occurred.</p> <p><i>See</i> CPUC Disallowances and Adjustments.</p>

<p>the second pilot is not contingent on the first, and orders the utilities to begin conducting the pilots together.</p>	<p>complete the submetering protocol. We fear that the currently proposed schedule is already too long, so we strongly urge the Commission to run the proposed pilots concurrently.”</p> <p><i>GPI/CEC’s Reply Comments on Load Research and Submetering Roadmap</i>, 4/19/13, at 5.</p> <p>In our Reply, we argue, on pg. 5, “GPI/CEC disagree with PG&E’s statement and urge PG&E to proceed concurrently with both pilots, if at all possible, or, at the least, complete all planning for the Phase 2 pilot that doesn’t strictly depend on Phase 1 results. There may be some aspects of the phase 2 pilot that cannot be finalized before the completion of the phase 1 pilot, but that is no excuse to delay proceeding with the majority of the planning for phase 2.”</p> <p><i>GPI/CEC’s Comments on the PD</i>, 10/21/13, at 8.</p> <p>The GPI supports the PD on moving both phases of the pilot along in tandem, stating, on pg. 8: “We fully support the Commission’s decision to require the Multiple COR pilot to start in December of 2014 without being contingent on the Single COR pilot.”</p> <p>On pg. 8, the Decision acknowledges our argument that customers in the pilots should pay their own behind-the-meter costs.</p> <p>On pg. 10, the Decision acknowledges our support for committing to both phases of the pilot project at the same time, and that the second pilot should be authorized without regard to the results of the first project.</p>	
<p>5. Allow Participation of Net-Metering Customers in Pilots</p> <p>The utilities have been</p>	<p><i>GPI/CEC’s Comments on Load Research and Submetering Roadmap</i>, 4/9/13, 3-4.</p>	<p>Verified; but some duplication occurred. <i>See</i> CPUC Disallowances and</p>

<p>extremely resistant to the inclusion of net-metering customers in the pilots, and to putting net metering into the initial group of use cases for the net metering protocols. The GPI strongly supported the inclusion of net-metering, pointing out that a significant fraction of PEV customers were also net-metering customers.</p> <p>The Decision allows net metering customers to participate in the pilots, and demonstrates the importance of prompt development of submetering protocols for NEM customers.</p>	<p>The GPI argues, on pg. 3 of our <i>Comments</i>, “The NEM Use Case should be included in short-term development, in the submetering protocol, along with Use Cases 1-4, because it is likely that a substantial number of submetering customers will also be NEM customers due to the strong crossover interest in solar panels and electric cars.”</p> <p>GPI/CEC’s <i>Comments on the PD</i>, 10/21/13, at 4-7.</p> <p>We make a strong case for the inclusion of net metering in the pilot projects in some detail in our <i>Comments on the PD</i>.</p> <p>The Decision states, on pg. 27: “GPI disagreed with the exclusion of NEM customers given the number of PEV customers that are currently and potentially planning to enroll in NEM.”</p> <p>The Decision reverses its position from the PD on this issue, and permits net metering customers to participate in the pilots.</p>	Adjustments..
<p>6. Evaluation of Pilots</p> <p>The GPI was a strong advocate for extensive surveying of customer experience with the pilot projects. The Decision directs that a third-party evaluator will be retained to report on the performance of all three utilities’ pilots.</p>	<p>GPI/CEC’s <i>Comments on Load Research and Submetering Roadmap</i>, 4/9/13, at 6.</p> <p>We present, in our <i>Comments</i>, our recommendations for surveying participants in the pilots three times over the course of the pilot – at the beginning, in the middle, and at the end.</p> <p>On pgs. 11-13, the Decision acknowledges the GPI’s advocacy for regular and ongoing evaluation of customer experience and satisfaction in the pilots.</p>	<p>Verified; but some duplication occurred. See CPUC Disallowances and Adjustments..</p>
<p>7. Resist Extending Deadline for SubMetering Protocols</p> <p>D.11-07-029 established the need for the development of</p>	<p>GPI/CEC’s <i>Comments on Load Research and Submetering Roadmap</i>, 4/9/13, at 2.</p> <p>We expressed our frustration with delays in the development of the</p>	<p>Verified; but some duplication occurred. See CPUC Disallowances and</p>

<p>submetering protocols, and set a due date for the completion of the protocols of July 30, 2012. That date has continually slipped, and is now set by this D.13-11-002, at February 1, 2016.</p> <p>The GPI has consistently resisted the slippage in the due date for the protocols, emphasizing the fact that the market is taking off, and these protocols are needed to support the continued growth. Although we were unable to prevent substantial slippage, we believe that without our advocacy the due date would be even further in the future than it is today as a result of this Decision.</p>	<p>submetering protocols on pg. 2 of our <i>Comments</i>: “GPI/CEC would prefer that the Commission’s original submetering protocol development schedule be adhered to, but we will not object to the pilot proposal and its alternative schedule. We certainly see benefits from the pilot project proposal, including finding a middle ground solution between utility opposition and other parties’ positions.”</p> <p>GPI/CEC’s <i>Comments on the PD</i>, 10/21/13, at 4-7.</p> <p>We also express our frustration with the delays in the development of the submetering protocols in some detail in our <i>Comments on the PD</i>.</p> <p>GPI/CEC’s <i>Reply Comments on the PD</i>, 10/28/13, at 2-3.</p> <p>The GPI argued, on pg. 3 of our <i>Reply</i>: “We recommend that the final decision resolve these contradictions by reaffirming that the protocol will in fact be required by Sept. 30, 2015 – or, in the alternative, as we discuss below, three months after the close of the Phase 1 Pilot. The EV market can’t afford any more delays in this important policy for cost savings for EV owners.”</p> <p>The Decision finds, on pg. 44, that the submetering pilots are a necessary component of the development of the protocols, and sets a due date for the final protocols of February 1, 2016.</p>	Adjustments..
---	---	---------------

B. Duplication of Effort (§§ 1801.3(f) & 1802.5):

	Claimant	CPUC Verified
a. Was the Office of Ratepayer Advocates (ORA) a party to the proceeding?²	Yes.	Verified.

² The Division of Ratepayer Advocates was renamed the Office of Ratepayer Advocates effective September 26, 2013, pursuant to Senate Bill No. 96 (Budget Act of 2013: public resources), which was approved by the Governor on September 26, 2013.

b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to yours?	Yes.	Verified.
c. If so, provide name of other parties: Southern California Gas Company, Sacramento Municipal Utility District, EVSP Coalition, A Better Place, Coulomb Technologies, Inc., Clean Energy Fuels Corp., Western States Petroleum Assoc., Division of Ratepayer Advocates, The Utility Reform Network, National Resource Defense Council, Friends of the Earth, California for Renewable Energy, Inc., North Coast Rivers Alliance, Interstate Renewable Energy Council, Environmental Defense Fund, Consumer Federation of California, General Motors, Greenlining Institute, and the three large IOUs.		Verified.
d. Describe how you coordinated with ORA and other parties to avoid duplication or how your participation supplemented, complemented, or contributed to that of another party: This proceeding covers a wide variety of topics related to alternative-fueled vehicles. The GPI has focused its participation in our primary area of interest, the conversion of transportation to run on renewable energy. Green Power coordinated its efforts in this proceeding with other parties in order to avoid duplication of effort, and added significantly to the outcome of the Commission's deliberations. In fact, in many cases (<i>see</i> Attachment 2) GPI filed joint Comments with the Community Environmental Council, an indication of our collaborative efforts. Some amount of duplication has occurred in this proceeding on all sides of contentious issues, but Green Power avoided duplication to the extent possible, and tried to minimize it where it was unavoidable.		Verified; however some duplication occurred with other parties. <i>See</i> CPUC Disallowances and Adjustments.

PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION

A. General Claim of Reasonableness (§§ 1801 & 1806):

a. Intervenor's claim of cost reasonableness:	CPUC Verified
<p>The GPI is providing, in Attachment 2, a listing of all of the pleadings we provided in this Proceeding, Rulemaking 09-08-009 that are relevant to matters covered by this Claim, and a detailed breakdown of GPI staff time spent for work performed that was directly related to our substantial contributions to D.13-06-014, and D.13-11-002.</p> <p>The hours claimed herein in support of D.13-06-014, and D.13-11-002 are reasonable given the scope of the Proceeding, and the strong participation by the GPI. GPI staff maintained detailed contemporaneous time records indicating the number of hours devoted to the matters settled by these Decisions in this case. In preparing Attachment 2, Dr. Morris reviewed all of the recorded hours devoted to this proceeding, and included only those that were reasonable and contributory to the underlying tasks. As a result, the GPI submits that all of the hours included in</p>	Verified.

the attachment are reasonable, and should be compensated in full.

Dr. Morris is a renewable energy analyst and consultant with more than twenty-five years of diversified experience and accomplishments in the energy and environmental fields. He is a nationally recognized expert on biomass and renewable energy, climate change and greenhouse-gas emissions analysis, integrated resources planning, and analysis of the environmental impacts of electric power generation. Dr. Morris holds a BA in Natural Science from the University of Pennsylvania, an MSc in Biochemistry from the University of Toronto, and a PhD in Energy and Resources from the University of California, Berkeley.

Dr. Morris has been actively involved in electric utility restructuring in California throughout the past two decades. He served as editor and facilitator for the Renewables Working Group to the California Public Utilities Commission in 1996 during the original restructuring effort, consultant to the CEC Renewables Program Committee, consultant to the Governor's Office of Planning and Research on renewable energy policy during the energy crisis years, and has provided expert testimony in a variety of regulatory and legislative proceedings, as well as in civil litigation.

Mr. Hunt is a renewable energy law and policy expert with substantial experience in California, in local energy planning and in state energy-policy development. He has worked with local governments throughout Southern California, in his current role with Community Renewable Solutions LLC and in his previous role as Energy Program Director for the Community Environmental Council, a well-known non-profit organization based in Santa Barbara. Mr. Hunt was the lead author of the Community Environmental Council's A New Energy Direction, a blueprint for Santa Barbara County to wean itself from fossil fuels by 2030. Mr. Hunt also contributes substantially to state policy, in Sacramento at the Legislature and in San Francisco at the California Public Utilities Commission, in various proceedings related to renewable energy, energy efficiency, community-scale energy projects, and climate change policy. Mr. Hunt is also a Lecturer in Climate Change Law and Policy at UC Santa Barbara's Bren School of Environmental Science & Management (a graduate-level program). He received his law degree from the UCLA School of Law in 2001, where he was chief managing director of the Journal for International Law and Foreign Affairs. Mr. Hunt is a regular columnist at Renewable Energy World

D.98-04-059 states, on pgs. 33-34, "Participation must be productive in the sense that the costs of participation should bear a reasonable relationship to the benefits realized through such participation. ... At a minimum, when the benefits are intangible, the customer should present information sufficient to justify a Commission finding that the overall benefits of a customer's participation will exceed a customer's costs." This proceeding was concerned with preparing the market for electric-powered transportation. PEVs have the potential to not only bring renewable energy into the transportation sector, they also have the potential to revolutionize the way the integrated electricity grid is operated. If successful, the efforts that have begun in this proceeding have the potential to save ratepayers millions of dollars annually in terms of reduced costs of grid operations, and to do

so without any incremental emissions of greenhouse gases. These cost reductions overwhelm the cost of our participation in this proceeding.	
b. Reasonableness of Hours Claimed. The GPI made Significant Contributions to D.13-06-014, and D.13-11-002 by participating in working groups, and providing a series of Commission filings on the various topics that were under consideration in the Proceeding, and are covered by this Claim. Attachment 2 provides a detailed breakdown of the hours that were expended in making our Contributions. The hourly rates and costs claimed are reasonable and consistent with awards to other intervenors with comparable experience and expertise. The Commission should grant the GPI's claim in its entirety.	Verified.
c. Allocation of Hours by Issue 1. Extend common-facility treatment 5% 2. Order utilities to continue EV load research activities 5% 3. Adopt roadmap for 2 phase pilot project 55% 4. Commit to both phases of pilot without contingencies 5% 5. Allow participation of net-metering customers in pilots 15% 6. Evaluation of pilots 5% 7. Resist extending deadline for submetering protocols 10%	

B. Specific Claim:**

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
G. Morris	2011	16.00	\$240	D.11-07-025	\$3,840.00	16	\$240 ³	\$3,840.00
G. Morris	2012	20.00	\$245	D.13-05-009	\$4,900.00	20	\$245 ⁴	\$4,900.00
G. Morris	2013	22.50	\$250	See comment 1	\$5,625.00	22.5	\$250 ⁵	\$5,625.00
T. Hunt	2011	35.25	\$330	D.12-09-014	\$10,643.00	23.65	\$330 ⁶	\$7,804.50
T. Hunt	2012	92.50	\$340	D.13-12-021	\$31,450.00	61.98	\$340 ⁷	\$21,073.20
T. Hunt	2013	62.25	\$345	See comment 2	\$21,476.00	41.71	\$345 ⁸	\$14,389.95
Subtotal: \$77,934.00						Subtotal: \$57,632.65		
INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **								

³ Approved in Decision (D.) 11-07-025.⁴ Approved in D.13-10-012.⁵ Application of 2.0% Cost-of-Living Adjustment (COLA) in Resolution ALJ-287.⁶ Approved in D.14-07-024.⁷ Approved in D.14-07-024.⁸ Approved in D.14-07-024.

Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate	Total \$
G. Morris	2013	16	\$125	½ rate for 2013	\$2,000.00	16	\$125	\$2,000.00
Subtotal: \$2,000.00						Subtotal: \$2,000.00		
TOTAL REQUEST: \$79,934.00						TOTAL AWARD: \$59,632.65		
<p>* We remind all intervenors that Commission staff may audit their records related to the award and that intervenors must make and retain adequate accounting and other documentation to support all claims for intervenor compensation. Intervenor’s records should identify specific issues for which it seeks compensation, the actual time spent by each employee or consultant, the applicable hourly rates, fees paid to consultants and any other costs for which compensation was claimed. The records pertaining to an award of compensation shall be retained for at least three years from the date of the final decision making the award.</p> <p>** Reasonable claim preparation time typically compensated at ½ of preparer’s normal hourly rate.</p>								
ATTORNEY INFORMATION								
Attorney		Date Admitted to CA BAR ⁹		Member Number		Actions Affecting Eligibility (Yes/No?) If “Yes”, attach explanation		
Tamlyn (Tam) Hunt		January 29, 2002		218673		No; please note from January 1, 2005 until April 27, 2009 Hunt was an inactive member of the California State Bar.		

D. CPUC Disallowances and Adjustments:

Item	Reason
(1) Disallowance for duplication of efforts.	We impose a 33% disallowance on Tam Hunt's hours due to unneeded duplication. Many of the hours spent by Hunt on issues 3-7 duplicated the work of ORA and CCSE. As such, the following time is disallowed: for 2011, 11.63 hours; for 2012, 30.52 hours; and for 2013, 20.54 hours.

PART IV: OPPOSITIONS AND COMMENTS

A. Opposition: Did any party oppose the Claim?	No.
B. Comment Period: Was the 30-day comment period waived (see Rule 14.6(2)(6))?	Yes.

⁹ This information may be obtained through the State Bar of California's website at <http://members.calbar.ca.gov/fal/MemberSearch/QuickSearch>.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Green Power Institute has made a substantial contribution to D.13-06-014 and D.13-11-002.
2. The requested hourly rates for Green Power Institute's representatives are comparable to market rates paid to experts and advocates having comparable training and experience and offering similar services.
3. The claimed costs and expenses are reasonable and commensurate with the work performed.
4. The total of reasonable compensation is \$59,632.65.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

1. The Claim, with any adjustment set forth above satisfies all requirements of Public Utilities Code Sections 1801-1812.

ORDER

1. Green Power Institute shall be awarded \$59,632.65.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, and Southern California Edison Company shall pay the Green Power Institute their respective shares of the award based on their California-jurisdictional electric and gas revenues for the 2013 calendar year, to reflect the year in which the proceeding was primarily litigated. Payment of the award shall include compound interest at the rate earned on prime, three-month non-financial commercial paper as reported in Federal Reserve Statistical Release H.15, beginning March 29, 2014, the 75th day after the filing of Green Power Institute request, and continuing until full payment is made.
3. The comment period for today's decision is waived.
4. This decision is effective today.

Dated _____, at San Francisco, California.

APPENDIX**Compensation Decision Summary Information**

Compensation Decision:		Modifies Decision?	N/A
Contribution Decision(s):	D.13-06-014 and D.13-11-002		
Proceeding(s):	R0908009		
Author:	ALJ DeAngelis		
Payer(s):	Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, Southern California Gas Company.		

Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Claim Date	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier?	Reason Change/Disallowance
Green Power Institute	1/13/2014	\$79,934.00	\$59,632.65	N/A	Duplication.

Advocate Information

First Name	Last Name	Type	Intervenor	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted
Gregory	Morris	Expert	Green Power Institute	\$240	2011	\$240
Gregory	Morris	Expert	Green Power Institute	\$245	2012	\$245
Gregory	Morris	Expert	Green Power Institute	\$250	2013	\$250
Tamlyn	Hunt	Attorney	Green Power Institute	\$330	2011	\$330
Tamlyn	Hunt	Attorney	Green Power Institute	\$340	2012	\$340
Tamlyn	Hunt	Attorney	Green Power Institute	\$345	2013	\$345

(END OF APPENDIX)